

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 17 2010

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all the claims in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

In response to the objections to the claims, the claims have been amended.

In response to the rejection of claims 8-11, 15 and 17 under 35 USC 112, 2nd para., the claims have been amended.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-14 and 16 under 35 USC 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by US6445670 to Oshima, applicant traverses this rejection.

More specifically, Oshima does not disclose " at least one current output of a first optical detector unit is connected directly at a common current output node to a corresponding current output of a second optical detector unit" as recited in claim 1. Also, Oshima does not disclose multiple optical detectors connected to a common output node and " said output node being directly connected to a processing terminal of the signal processing circuit" as recited in claim 1.

Anticipation requires that each element of applicants claim be identically disclosed in a single prior art reference, but there are elements in claim 1 that are not disclosed in Oshima. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-5 and 8-14 and 16 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Oshima does not disclose " the first optical detector unit and the second optical detector unit each comprising an array of detector segments and being connected together to a common current output node defining a current output of the

first optical detector unit and the second optical detector unit" as recited in claim 15. Also, Oshima does not disclose "a signal processing circuit having a processing terminal which is directly connected to the common current output node so that the processing terminal is directly connected to both the first optical detector unit and the second optical detector unit" as recited in claim 15.

Anticipation requires that each element of applicants claim be identically disclosed in a single prior art reference, but there are elements in claim 15 that are not disclosed in Oshima. Therefore, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 17 is dependent on claim 15 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicant may be reached by telephone at the number given below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) including fees for any required extension of time, to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael E. Belk/  
Michael E. Belk, Reg.

33,357

Senior Patent Attorney  
(914) 333-9643